



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,714	12/19/2000	Bjarke De Jaeger Gotfredsen	Scard-card reader	3520
7590 11/05/2003			EXAMINER	
DANIEL P. MAGUIRE ATTORNEY AT LAW 423 E STREET DAVIS, CA 95616			FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/674,714

Applicant(s)

GOTFREDSEN, BJARKE DE
JAEGER

Examiner

Jamara A. Franklin

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 22.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made of the receipt of the response received on 5/30/03. Claims 1-32 are currently pending.

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: mouse pad unit comprising a data storage read/write device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-13, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Patret (PCT WO 95/24008).

Patret teaches, as illustrated in figure 4, a mouse pad unit (peripheral device) comprising a data storage read/write device (card insertion slots 110, 112). Please refer to Patret (US 5,661,633) for translation of the PCT reference, and particularly to col. 5, lines 25-54.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patret in view of Panasik et al. (US 5,987,547) (hereinafter referred to as 'Panasik').

The teachings of Patret have been discussed above.

Patret lacks the teaching of a CD-ROM, DVD, or removable hard drive integrated with the mouse pad unit.

Panasik teaches a portable computer 18 with means for processing data on a removable hard drive, a CD-ROM, or DVD (col. 3, lines 33-38).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that providing the mouse pad unit of Wilson with the various forms of data storage read/write devices would have been beneficial for allowing a variety of different forms of data to be stored and retrieved. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Patret with the data processing device as taught by Panasik.

6. Claims 25-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patret in view of House (US 4,799,054).

The teachings of Patret have been discussed above.

Art Unit: 2876

Patret lack the teaching of text placed on the exterior surface of the mouse pad.

House teaches a mouse pad having advertisement incorporated onto a mouse pad (col. 7, lines 42-47).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that the inclusion of visual information onto the mouse pad would have been advantageous since it would have immediately made the user aware of a product or to any particular pertinent data whenever the user looked in the direction of his hand. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Patret with the placement of the advertisement was taught by House.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-5, filed 5/30/03, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-32 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Patret.

After careful consideration, the examiner applies a broader interpretation directed toward the "mouse pad". As broadly interpreted by the examiner, any flat surface on which a mouse may operate may constitute a "mouse pad". In the case of the Patret reference, the peripheral device includes a thin flat housing suitable for placing on a work surface and having a generally planar smooth surface top.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Patret (US 5,661,633) teaches a keyboard and screen peripheral device for a computer and a desk pad.

Lim (US 6,442,019) teaches a computer having a built-in mouse rack.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is 703-305-0128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Jamara A. Franklin
Examiner
Art Unit 2876

JAF
October 31, 2003



**DIANE I. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER**